COPC No. 3 of 2005.

11.5.2007 Present: Mr. Vinay Kuthiala, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramakant Sharma, Advocate, for the respondent.

After hearing learned Counsel for the parties and on going through the reply filed by the respondent, I feel convinced that no contempt has been committed by the respondent. This Court in its judgment dated 13th November, 2003 had issued a direction qua the respondents therein to consider the claim of the writ petitioner for grating him the benefits in terms of the resettlement and rehabilitation plan. Even though this plan does stipulate the provision of suitable employment, upon reading of the plan as a whole and in the light of the specific averment made in the reply, especially the averment relating to the non-availability of the jobs after the commissioning of the project, I feel that in the facts and circumstances of the case the respondent has not committed any contempt. The petition is dismissed. The dismissal of this contempt petition or the finding by me that no contempt has been committed by the respondent in not providing job to the petitioner's one family member shall not come in the way of the respondent-Corporation granting to the petitioner and the petitioner obtaining the alternative package.

CMP No. 353 of 2006.

No order, in view of the order passed in the main petition. The application is disposed of.

May 11, 2007 **(V.K. Gupta), C. J.**
(rc)